

6th February 1923]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I have no objection to examine the question."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" Sympathetically ? "

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Certainly."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" Do you withdraw the resolution ? "

Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA :—" Only if the hon. Minister says that he will consider the matter sympathetically."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I will examine that question. I have every sympathy for the schoolmasters."

Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA :—" As the hon. the Minister for Education has assured me that he will consider the question sympathetically, I beg leave to withdraw my resolution."

The resolution was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar was then called upon to move his resolution.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I now beg to move under Standing Order No. 34 that the rest of the business before this House be adjourned."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" I have already called upon Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar to move his resolution."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Under the Standing Order I can move for an adjournment at any time provided I do not interrupt a speech, and my hon. friend has not begun his speech."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" I have called upon the hon. Member to move his resolution. Please let him go on."

Irrigation facilities in the famine-affected districts.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move—

53. *That this Council recommends to the Government that special steps be taken to improve the irrigation resources of Bellary and the neighbouring districts comprised in the famine zone of the Madras Presidency.*

" Sir, the districts more especially contemplated in the resolution are what are popularly known as the Deccan districts. I shall try to show in the course of my speech : firstly, that famines are more or less the normal feature of these districts ; secondly, that they are due to deficient rainfall and to the very limited protected area ; thirdly, that the people have no means to fight the famines during their duration or resist their effects afterwards and that the only remedy lies in the improvement of irrigation resources of these districts ; fourthly, that there are immense possibilities in the districts for the development of their irrigation resources ; fifthly, that the Government have systematically ignored these possibilities and, not only that, but neglected to keep in repairs the irrigation works constructed by the ancient rulers and that the Government can no longer afford to delay the execution of the Tungabhadra and other projects ; sixthly, that there can be no doubt whatever that

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[6th February 1923]

these works would amply protect a large part of the affected districts; and seventhly, that the Government stand to gain very much by the initiation and carrying out of the several projects.

"First of all, I shall take the famines these unfortunate districts have passed through. I am afraid, Sir, famines have become more numerous in the Deccan districts after their cession to the British Government than before, as I will show presently. The first famine after these districts were ceded to the British Government was that of 1802-04. Then there was the famine of 1805-07 which Sir Thomas Munro described as 'beyond all comparison, worse than any before known.' This was followed by the famines of 1824 and 1833. One of the Collectors described the famine of 1833 as being even worse than the one of 1805-07. Twenty years afterwards was the famine of 1854; but, as a matter of fact, the famine began much earlier, that is, in 1852-53. Ten years later the signs of famine began again to manifest themselves, but the Government delayed relief until 1866 when, according to the official reports, 'the poorer ryots, the hired labourers, and especially the Bedar and other low castes, were in a pitiable condition, supporting life upon edible leaves and nuts, pounded tamarind stones and the pulp of the aloe.' People wandered about to seek livelihood in the Mysore and the Nizam's States, and according to official reports 'numbers perished by the way during these migrations, and it was not unusual to find lying on the roads and streets dead bodies of these famished wayfarers.'

"Next, we come to the great famine of 1876-78. I shall not pause, Sir, to describe the gruesome details of that famine, how the Government were at first indifferent to the miseries of the poor people, how they made experiments with the wages and the scale of diet due to them in spite of the advice of the then Sanitary Commissioner, and how people suffered unutterable misery and died in thousands. Next we come to the famine of 1884-85 and then to the famines of 1891-92 and 1896-97. There was scarcity in the year 1900, and, according to the statistical atlas, the years 1904, 1905 and 1907 were very bad years. In 1908 test works had to be started in parts of the Bellary district. The statistical atlas for the next decennium has not yet been prepared; but still I make bold to say that in the decennium ending 1920-21, there have been innumerable bad seasons. We had famine only in 1921-22, and again, Sir, we are face to face with another famine.

"Now it needs no argument to say that these famines are due to deficient rainfall and to the lack of any protected area worth mentioning. In the Bellary and Anantapur districts the rainfall is smaller than anywhere else: Kurnool and Cuddapah do not fare much better. I do not want to take up the time of the House by re-reading the numerous extracts from the District Gazetteer which my friend, Mr. Siva Rao, read here some time ago. Suffice it to say that what is stated in the District Gazetteer is confirmed by later writers who have bestowed special attention to this subject. Mr. Mackenzie has said in his report on the Tungabhadra project:

It is not at all strange that 50 per cent of years on record should prove to be below average, but in the present case, with such a moderate rainfall, the point to be brought out is that any slight deficiency may often mean a bad harvest. It is also sometimes the case that a year of average rainfall does not mean a good harvest owing to failure of rains in a critical month, notably in November.

And he supports his statement by reference to specific years.

6th February 1923] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

“ Now, Sir, if famines are a reality, one may ask whether the people have resources enough to withstand the effects of famine either in their duration or afterwards. This question was gone into by a commission appointed in regard to one of the famines and this is the conclusion they have come to :

The resources of the people consist briefly of land, cattle, grain, money and ornaments. The possession of land, except so much as is permanently protected by irrigation, is of but little help in a famine year. If the year's investment is either lost, or at best yields an insignificant return, the local money-lender refuses advances until prospects brighten, and there is but a dull market for those who are inclined to sell. The protection of cattle at such a time is difficult, for water and pasture are scanty and fodder runs up to a prohibitive price; it is practically impossible to dispose of animals even at a ruinous loss, and numbers die. It is only the richer class that have any appreciable amount of grain to hoard and the general opinion of district officers is that, as facilities for disposal of stocks are increased by the extension of railways, the tendency to hoard decreases. In the Deccan, compared with the other districts, ornaments are very rare.

“ All this is a fact. In another place the commission have stated that ‘ it may safely be said that, with the exception of a small minority, the land-holders are little better off than the labourers they employ. And after each famine it takes years for the people to recover from its effects, if they ever do at all.’

So much then, Sir, for the capacity of the people to resist famine.

“ It follows that if anything is to be done to mitigate the effects of famine it must be by developing the irrigation sources of the country involved. The question may be asked whether there are possibilities for developing the resources of the districts. Here is, Sir, what Colonel Henderson wrote about the potentialities of the Bellary district which then included the present Anantapur also.

‘ The district of Bellary’ he says, ‘ is almost bountifully supplied with rivers and tributary systems for the irrigation of its soil. It certainly does not possess the advantages inherent to a district situated at the delta of an important river on the sea coast, but it contains within itself all the essential elements of prosperity. The rivers and systems which intersect it may be taken advantage of to a larger extent than now for the supply of works of irrigation.’ ”

The hon. Sir K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ May I know to what date it relates ? ”

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ It dates back to 1853. I hope, Sir, the rivers which existed then continue to exist even now. Kelsall's Manual, published in 1872, mentions a number of projects which at the time would have cost the Government comparatively small sums and yielded good returns also. It mentions, for example, Buckacherla project, Roddam project and Hindupur project which would in the aggregate have cost 16 lakhs of rupees protected thousands of acres and yielded a return of 6 to 7 per cent. The upper Bellary and lower Bellary projects might have been undertaken at a cost under a crore of rupees. But the Government did nothing in these directions. Not only did the Government not construct any new works, but they neglected to keep in repair even the old ones. This neglect I cannot but characterize as culpable. The first serious flood after the districts were ceded to the Company was that of October 1804. Writing to the board on the 4th November of that year, Sir Thomas Munro stated :

In consequence of torrents of rain between 12th and 15th of last month all the rivers and nullahs rose to a height never before remembered, the greater part of the tanks have been destroyed, over every part of the country from Harpanahalle and Chitwel. The nullahs out from rivers have been buried in sand, and in many places so deep that it is difficult to discover the former channels.

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[6th February 1923]

"In May, of the next year, he sent some details of the damage done

In the four ceded districts, 4 dams, 752 tanks, 260 nullahs and 865 wells have been either destroyed or greatly injured.

"Ten years later, in 1817 the monsoon again set in with great violence. Writing in the following year the Collector reported that 117 tanks, 58 channels and 312 wells in Bellary and Anantapur had been either breached or seriously injured. The damage in the Cuddapah district was very great in the taluks north of the Pennar. The river itself burst its banks and it is said to have extended in most places to a width of several miles. Fifty-three tanks in the Rayachoti taluk breached or suffered serious damage. On May 8 and 9 of 1920 there was another violent storm which damaged over a hundred tanks in Rayachoti taluk. In the great storm of 1851,

253 tanks within its influence in Bellary and Anantapur having an ayacut assessed at 2½ lakhs were more or less seriously injured. Channels were swept away or obliterated, much land was ruined by the sand which was deposited on it, the anicut across the Tungabhadra at Ramporam was damaged, tanks at Darogi and Harishi and the Nallacheruvu in Bellary town were breached and the town of Gulim, on the bank of the Hagari in Alur, which was formerly the headquarters of a taluk, was swept away and many lives were lost. In Anantapur district, the destruction was even greater than in Bellary. The great tanks at Singanamala, Anantapur and Dharmavaram were breached.

"I have not been able to get at the precise figures as to the damage done to tanks and nullahs during the several floods in the Kurnool district. There can be no doubt that the district also suffered like its neighbours, though perhaps on a less severe scale.

"The District Gazetteer of Kurnool refers in one place to a number of ruined tanks in the district. Against only one of these there is the remark that it was in ruins before the district came into the possession of the British Government, implying thereby that all the rest went into disrepair after their transfer to the British Government. Now, what did Government do to restore this enormous number of damaged tanks? They laid down a rule which, to say the least, was extremely unjust to the people of the districts and it was this—to restore only such of them as possessed sufficient ayacut to repay the outlay in four years. They did not change their policy even after its disastrous effects became palpably clear. For there was a huge storm in 1851, and again it was directed that 'only those works should be put in order which would cost less than four years revenue to restore'. The only exceptions were Darogi in Bellary and Singanamala in Anantapur. What does this show? It shows that the Government wanted 25 per cent return on the money they spent before they would raise their little finger to afford any relief to the poor people. These tanks were not constructed by the Government of the day, but were given to them by the ancient rulers. Even Marwadis would not claim as much as 25 per cent on the money they lend, and if the Government claim such a usurious return before they would restore these tanks, no wonder, Sir, that the British are called a nation of shopkeepers. What has been the result of all this? Hundreds of tanks and other sources of irrigation went into ruin and, as remarked by the Irrigation Commission:

These five districts—Nellore less than the other or Deccan districts—are more liable to severe visitations of drought than any other part of the Madras Presidency, and to use the words of Mr. Mackenzie:

The tract suffers frequently—it may also be said *habitually*—from insufficient rainfall.

"Then, Sir, the question arises, suppose we establish some irrigation scheme or other, will it really afford protection to the areas concerned? I shall only

6th February 1923] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

read the official report to answer this query. The several Collectors reported their opinions about the Tungabhadra project, and the extremely conservative and cautious Board of Revenue endorsed their opinions in the following words :

On the whole the Board considers that the Government of India may safely be assured that the Tungabhadra project will give adequate protection to the whole tract concerned against famine.

So much then, Sir, for the protective value of these projects.

"Next I want to show, Sir, that the Government stand to gain in many ways by initiating these projects. First of all, Sir, they are giving year after year seasonal remissions. Because of the insufficiency of water the Government are forced to grant remissions. I calculated for 45 years from 1866 and the remissions so granted amounted in the five districts (the four ceded districts and Nellore which would benefit by the Tungabhadra project) to $2\frac{1}{4}$ crores of rupees, and if you add the remissions granted before 1866 and since 1910 we should not be wrong, I think, in putting the figure at four or five crores. I venture to submit, Sir, that if the Tungabhadra project is made a reality there will be no occasion for granting most of these remissions. And then, Sir, every time there is a famine or a bad season the Forest Department have to forego the revenue they would otherwise get by way of grazing fees, etc. Here also the Government stand to gain by the initiation of these projects. Again, the Government have to give, every time there is a famine, huge sums under the Agriculturists' Loans Act, and afterwards they find that they cannot collect the amount they have advanced and are obliged to write off either the interest and the principal or the interest alone.

"I take it, Sir, that these sums totalled together will not be found insignificant, and the Government stand to save most of this money if the area under discussion is properly protected by irrigation works.

"And then on the famine operations themselves, it is stated in the Tungabhadra Project Report that as much as over six crores of rupees represent the cost of relief operations, and the losses of revenue due to deficient rainfall in the five districts which would profit by the project during the 26 years beginning, presumably, from 1876. Even if you take away from the above figure the seasonal remissions granted, you may safely take it that the amount spent in these 26 years on famine operations and relief of distress will amount to nearly five crores of rupees. If to this amount you add the expenditure incurred in connexion with relief of distress before 1876 and after 1902, namely, the figures relating to the years 1802, 1804, 1805, 1807, 1824, 1833, 1854, 1866, 1904, 1905, 1907, 1908 and 1921-22, I think, Sir, the figure will run up to several other crores. Most of the expenditure would be saved to Government by the acceptance of my resolution and giving effect to it.

"Sir, I crave the indulgence of the hon. the Deputy President and of the House for exceeding my time-limit.

"The enormous loss of human life may next be taken into account. In the famine of 1863-64 it is stated that people perished by the way during their migrations and that it was not unusual to find lying on the roads and streets the dead bodies of the famished wayfarers. The loss of life in the years 1876 and 1878 was of course very considerable. It is said that as much as 17 to 20 per cent in Bellary, Cuddapah and Anantapur, and 26 per cent in

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[6th February 1923]

Kurnool died, during that famine. The decrease in the population due to famine in these districts between the Census of 1871 and that of 1881 was no less than 8 lakhs and odd. I shall not pursue that subject further. It will suffice to say that while the population of the Presidency in 1921 shows an increase of 35 per cent over that of 1871, that of the Deccan districts shows a decrease of 1 per cent and Bellary even as much as 2·1 per cent. In other words, it means, Sir, that as many as 1,440,000 people have died during these fifty years, purely from economic causes.

"As regards the loss of cattle, it is stated in the official records relating to the famines of 1802 and 1804 that great numbers of cattle employed in the transport of grain perished. I think they fared equally badly in the famine of 1807 which was worse than any known before. As regards the cattle mortality in 1854, Mr. Pelly, the then Collector, estimated that four-fifths of the cattle had perished and the villages were said to be strewn with their bones. Again, in the famine of 1866, the mortality among cattle was estimated at 35,000 head worth $9\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of rupees. In the famines of 1876 and 1878 the loss of cattle should have been enormous. Even so late as in the famine of 1891 and 1892 it is said that the loss of cattle was very great. In some taluks one-fourth and even one-third of the breeding and young stock died and there was a general loss of 8 per cent of the tilling cattle. In the famine of 1896 and 1897, the cattle, as usual, suffered severely. Though in May 1897 all the forests of the district were thrown open to free grazing, a measure which was calculated to have benefited 60,000 head, the cattle census of 1897 showed 97,000 head of cattle and 61,000 sheep and goats less than that of 1895.

"Sir, I have already referred to a few of the projects proposed in the past for execution; some of them are likely to pay a reasonable return and prove to be paying concerns. Mr. Kelsel refers in his Manual at page 230 to some of the schemes initiated but left unfinished by the previous rulers. He refers to 'the remains of three anicuts at Moodel-hutte, Soogur and Mancherla. The first and third are supposed to have been commenced under the former Hindu Government, and to have been left unfinished on account of political disturbances. Regarding the one at Mancherla Colonel Henderson has recorded that it is in good order and principally wants an irrigation channel.' Why should not Government take up and finish those works in their régime of 'peace and prosperity'. In the earlier part of my speech, I referred to projects like Bukkapatnam, Roddam and Hindupur, which were expected to yield at the time as much as 6 to 7 per cent. These may also be considered. A dam may perhaps be put across Hagari between Byravanitippa of Kalyandrug and Tallikeru of Rayadurg taluk. This would bring a large area under irrigation and protect Rayadurg taluk to a great extent. Again improvements to Basavangudi channel in Hospet are possible, and if carried out will assure a better supply to the Kamalapuram tank and bring an additional ayacut under irrigation. Within the limits of the taluks of Hadagalli and Harpanahalli is the Sagi Reserve, and I am told that if two hills there are connected by a bund, a large and useful tank may be formed. And last, but most important of all, is the Tungabhadra project, estimated to cost 17 crores and give an income of 3·5 per cent. Now, I suppose it will cost half as much again and the return will be only about 2 per cent. Even so, is it not incumbent upon the Government to undertake this scheme? Would they not save themselves the loss of revenue

6th February 1923] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

due to seasonal remissions, due to their frequently throwing open all reserves for free grazing, due to remission of principal and interest under the Agriculturists' Loans Act and save also the millions they are now obliged to spend fairly often on their famine operations? Have the Government no consideration for the enormous loss of life which is now taking place both among men and cattle? Is it not a factor which should strongly weigh with them? The Tungabhadra scheme, Sir, may possibly be made a little cheaper by confining its scope to the more essential objects and by lopping off the less important portions by omitting the costly reservoir in it and by dropping the proposal to take the supply to Nellore by a very expensive route. The scheme, thus modified, may be worked together with the Kistna Reservoir project, and if these two are treated as parts of the same unit, it will be possible, I learn, to evolve a combined scheme which has a reasonable chance of proving remunerative.

"I wish only to say in conclusion the Government have already delayed the matter far too long, and I say, Sir, it will not do for them to delay any further. Let them not pursue the short-sighted policy they have hitherto followed. The futility of such a policy cannot better be expressed than in the words of their own official, a Collector of the district. Here is what he said in 1886 in regard to practically the Tungabhadra project then known as upper Bellary and lower Bellary projects.

The estimated amount for these works is (without considering the reservoirs for the second crop) 95 lakhs of rupees, or under a million sterling. The interest on this sum if guaranteed by Government at 5 per cent, would amount to Rs. 4,75,000 or £47,500. In this district in 1854 there was actually lost four times that amount, viz., by hurried expenditure on famine roads, £130,000, and by remission on waste lands £60,000, to say nothing of the loss to the people of their crops and cattle."

"I need not say anything more to commend this proposal for the acceptance of this House."

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—"I second it, Sir."

SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB :—"I have great pleasure in rising to support this motion. After the able and pathetic appeal made by the hon. mover, after the graphic description given by him of the disappointing state of things in the Ceded Districts, and after all the arguments that have been urged with such force and supported by authorities, both modern and ancient, it is not necessary for me to supplement him with any remarks of mine. There is no denying the fact, Sir, that the Deccan districts in general, and Bellary and Anantapur in particular, are subject to frequent visitations of famine. All that the Government have hitherto been doing in fighting these visits have been by way of providing relief long after the famine had worked great hardship on the inhabitants. Even the little relief which the Government have been providing for the people who were undergoing the miseries and privations of famine has always been long delayed. The Government has been proverbially dilatory in coming forward to provide adequate relief. It takes months before a district visited with famine is declared to be a famine-affected area by the authorities, and, even after that is done, relief works are not started at once. Test works are started to begin with, and they are kept for weeks and weeks together, and just when the rigours of famine scarcity have been undergone by the people, the Government starts the relief works. So, Sir, the way in which the Government have been handling the situation and trying to provide remedy for this chronic evil has been very unsatisfactory. Every famine that visits these

[Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib] [6th February 1923]

districts leaves them poorer and less in a position to resist its subsequent visits. My hon. friend, the mover, has stated that the districts are not altogether devoid of natural irrigation resources. Only the authorities have not availed themselves of these resources. The result is that people have still to depend upon the monsoons which are always very disappointing. In my opinion, Sir, the Government, instead of trying to spend large sums of money in affording relief which comes always late, and instead of trying to provide relief from time to time and thus to tide over the momentary difficulties, would be well advised in trying to bring the lands under some sort of improvement, and the best way would be to improve the irrigation resources in the districts. I heartily support the resolution."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I now beg to move that under Standing Order No.34 the meeting be adjourned to the 27th February."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I beg to second it."

The hon. Sir K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I have not the slightest objection to it, Sir."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I know, Sir, what the effect of this motion will be upon my resolution? Will it be to put off this resolution altogether, or will there be a non-official day at the next meeting, on which the discussion on this resolution will be continued? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" On the next non-official day, this motion will take precedence over other motions, and it will begin exactly where it may be left to-day."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I know, Sir, if there will be a day for non-official business in this month, that is, in the next meeting? "

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I was under the impression that on the day that is appointed for the presentation of the Budget, the presentation itself would not take up the whole time of the House for the day. There being no other Government business that day, and as we know from past experience that the presentation of the Budget by the hon. the Finance Member will not take more than a couple of hours, I thought that the general discussion on the resolution of my hon. friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, could be continued on that day."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As for Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar's question as to when this resolution would come up, I can only give the answer 'when non-official business is next taken up.' As to when non-official business will be taken up is more than what I can say at this stage."

" Hon. Members are already aware that the Budget for the coming year will be presented on Tuesday, the 27th February, and His Excellency the Governor has allotted the following days for the remaining stages of the Budget :—

General discussion on the } 1st, 2nd and 3rd March.
Budget, 3 days.

Voting of demands for } 12th to 17th March, 19th to 21st March
grants, 10 days. } and 23rd March. The last day is
intended for the final voting of grants,
including supplemental demands as the
result of Budget discussion.

6th February 1923]

[The President]

“I hope this information will be of some use to hon. Members in forecasting their programmes.”

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“The hon. the Leader of the Opposition approached me on this matter and said the 26th instant would be allotted for non-official work and suggested that this meeting might be adjourned to that date. But now I do not understand what his present move in the matter is, and I do not know whom he is opposing. If there is going to be no non-official day at all, I leave myself entirely in your hands and I submit that the matter covered by my resolution is a very important one. From this motion I understand that there may not be any non-official day in the next meeting, and I find myself in a tight corner.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I will put Mr. Ramachandra Rao's motion to the House, and the hon. Member (Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar), can vote against it” (Laughter).

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“I know that I can do that, Sir, but you can easily understand as well as I do what the result of the voting is likely to be. But anyhow, I want to place my difficulty before you and I place myself entirely in your hands.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I am very sorry for the hon. Member. He will quite see that I really cannot do anything. I must put the motion to the House, and any understanding that there might be regarding it, is really a thing with which I could have no concern. I have already given all the information I had regarding the probable course of events when we meet next. The chances are that we may have some days for non-official work, but really it is not a thing on which I can say anything definite or that I have any right to commit myself.”

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—“Before the proposition is put to the vote, I would just like to say a word, Sir. 27th February has been decided for the presentation of the Budget. We all know that people would be rather excited at the time when the Budget is presented, and the atmosphere in the House would not be quite convenient for the effective discussion of non-official business. So I would suggest that we do meet on the 26th instant, that is, on the day previous to the presentation of the Budget, and that that day (26th) may be set apart for non-official business. So, I would like to move an amendment to the motion of Mr. Ramachandra Rao, to the effect that this meeting do adjourn to 26th February 1923.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“I second it.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The amendment before the House is—

That in place of the words ‘27th February’ the words ‘26th February’ be inserted.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I only wish to add one word, Sir. I have absolutely no objection to accept the amendment. But in answer to my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, I may only say that at one time I understood the Secretary to mean that the 26th instant was fixed as the day on which the Council would meet next, and that it was something like a provisional calendar. So I informed my friend that probably the 26th would be the day for the next meeting. But afterwards I understood that there was some change in the dates and so I moved for the 27th February. Anyhow, I am quite willing to accept the amendment.”

[6th February 1923]

The amendment was put to the House and carried.

The original motion of Mr. Ramachandra Rao as amended was then put to the House and carried ('That the meeting be adjourned to the 26th February.')

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Before rising I may inform the House that as regards the Committee about the Deputy President (those Members of this Council who are also members of that Committee may like to know) that I have fixed 3-30 p.m. to-morrow for its meeting. I hope it will be convenient to all hon. Members who are members of that Committee to attend it, and that it may be possible to finish the proceedings in time for them to leave this place in the evening."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I am extremely sorry, Sir, that I have arranged to leave this evening in view of the fact that this meeting would be adjourned."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"We shall take our chance, and I am sure that those who are not present will be glad to receive the report sent to them in a final shape."

The House then adjourned to meet again on the 26th instant at 11 a.m.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

APPENDIX A.

[Vide page 1724 supra.]

Proceedings of the twenty-second meeting for 1922-23 of the Standing Finance Committee of the Madras Legislative Council held at Fort St. George on Saturday, the 27th January 1923.

P R E S E N T :

- (1) The Hon'ble Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER, K.C.S.I. (Chairman).
 - (2) M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR Avargal.
 - (3) " Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR Avargal.
 - (4) " Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR Avargal.
 - (5) " A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR Avargal.
 - (6) Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB.
 - (7) Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN.
 - (8) Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL.
 - (9) Mr. C. E. WOOD.
- (Mr. W. HUTTON was also invited to be present.)

Read again scheme relating to the improvements to the Cooum River—Construction of the Harbour-Cooum canal (estimated cost about 14 lakhs). [The scheme was discussed in the meeting of the 18th January 1923 and was postponed for consideration.] Mr. Hutton, Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, who was invited to be present, explained the scheme to the Committee.

The Committee were unable to recommend expenditure on the scheme without further expert enquiry. They would recommend that the question